



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

52
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,882	02/07/2001	Hidehiro Matsumoto	074273/0180	4208
22428	7590	04/20/2005	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER				LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D
SUITE 500				ART UNIT
3000 K STREET NW				PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20007				2155

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/777,882

Applicant(s)

MATSUMOTO, HIDEHIRO

Examiner

Victor Lesniewski

Art Unit

2155

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 04 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 2,4-13 and 15-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____

VZ

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In the remarks, the applicant has argued that the cited prior art, namely LaMaire, does not disclose all features of the independent claims 2, 4, and 15 because he fails to disclose "reducing the amount of information accumulated in a cache memory of the client apparatus based on profile information indicative of a process ability of the client apparatus when it is judged that the information provided by an information source server can not be stored in the cache memory" as recited in claims 2, 4, and 15.

In response to this argument, it is noted that the applicant admits that "LaMaire discloses that when there is insufficient free space in a network object cache to store a new network object, an object in the cache is identified as a replacement and removed" on page 9 of the amendment filed 4/4/2005. Here "insufficient free space" meets the claimed limitation of a "process ability." Since LaMaire removes an object from the cache based on insufficient free space in the cache, he removes the object based on the inability of the client computer to process more information (i.e. a process ability). The term "process ability" has not been further defined in the claims. The applicant is reminded that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The applicant has also set forth arguments to claims 5-7, 9, 10, and other analogous dependent claims. These arguments lack specificity, but appear to refer to the discussion above of the "process ability." The statements made concern the "attribute information" claimed in the dependent claims where the attribute information is defined in the independent claims as being "composed of preference information of a user and profile information indicative of a process ability of the client apparatus." Thus the above remarks also apply to these arguments. In addition, the dependent claims do not further define a "process ability" as claimed in the independents.

Thus claims 2, 4-13, and 15-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by LaMaire et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,343,350).



HOSAIN ALAM
ADVISORY PATENT EXAMINER